A Graph Theoretic Approach to the Robustness of k-Nearest Neighbor Vehicle Platoons

Mohammad Pirani, Ehsan Hashemi, John W. Simpson-Porco, Baris Fidan and Amir Khajepour

arXiv:1607.01821v1 [math.OC] 6 Jul 2016

Abstract

We consider a graph theoretic approach to the performance and robustness of a platoon of vehicles, where each vehicle communicates with its k-nearest neighbors. In particular, we quantify the platoon's stability margin, robustness to disturbances (in terms of system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm), and maximum delay tolerance via graph-theoretic notions such as nodal degrees and (grounded) Laplacian matrix eigenvalues. Our results show that there is a trade-off between robustness to time delay and robustness to disturbances. Both first-order dynamics (reference velocity tracking) and second-order dynamics (controlling inter-vehicular distance) are analyzed in this direction. Theoretical contributions are confirmed via simulation results.

I. Introduction

Recent achievements in redefining system theoretic notions (such as stability and robustness) based on network properties have found various applications in real-world networked systems [1]. One important application is in connected and cooperative vehicles, which will have great impacts on forming future generation of urban transportation [2]. Among different applications of connected vehicles, cooperative cruise control has attracted much attention. This method is concerned with controlling vehicles' velocities to minimize fuel consumption and maintain prescribed inter-vehicular distances. However, one of the main challenges is to make these control policies resilient to external disturbances and to time delays in inter-vehicle communications.

M. Pirani, E. Hashemi, B. Fidan and A. Khajepour are with the Department of Mechanical and Mechatronics Engineering, University of Waterloo, ON, Canada. email: mpirani, ehashemi, fidan, a.khajepour@uwaterloo.ca. J. S. Porco is with the department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Waterloo, ON, Canada. email: jwsimpson@uwaterloo.ca

The aim of this paper is to present conditions for the robustness of a generalized form of vehicle platooning (called k-nearest neighbor platoon) to communication disturbances and time delay.

Much effort has been made in analyzing the robustness of vehicle platoons to communication disturbances and among them is the well-known notion of string stability [3]. String stability occurs if the transfer function from disturbance in the first vehicle in a platoon to state error in the last vehicle has a bounded frequency magnitude peak independent of the platoon size [4]. The notion of robustness was revisited later in terms of network coherence in the control theory literature [5]. It is shown that in 1-D network topologies it is impractical to have large coherent platoons with only local feedbacks. Alternatively, optimal controllers are designed in [6] to improve the coherence of a vehicle formation. The effect of time delay in vehicle communication on performance and stability in vehicle platoons was studied in [7], [8].

This paper is concerned with robustness analysis of vehicle platoons to delay and communication disturbances under two policies. First we analyze the velocity tracking scenario, which is applied to cases where the vehicle fuel consumption is to be minimized [9], [10]. Second, we analyze the network formation problem, where inter-vehicular distances are regulated to avoid collisions. In contrast with other works on robustness of vehicle platoons [11]–[14], here we present graph theoretic robustness conditions for both of the above communication policies and analyze the effect of the number and location of the reference vehicles (leaders) on robustness of the vehicle network. More specifically, the contributions of this paper are the followings:

- We provide graph theoretic bounds for the system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of the *velocity tracking scenario*. Moreover, we propose necessary and sufficient conditions for the value of the maximum constant time delay $\tau_{\max}$ for which the velocity tracking remains asymptotically stable.
- We provide graph theoretic bounds for the system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of the *network formation problem*. In addition, we introduce an upper bound for $\tau_{\max}$ such that the network formation remains asymptotically stable.

The paper is organized as follows. We start by introducing some required notations in Section II and in Section III the network dynamics for both *velocity tracking* and *network formation* is provided. Section IV briefly presents some graph theoretic bounds on the extreme eigenvalues of the grounded Laplacian matrix which are used in Sections V and VI to establish conditions for the robustness of k-nearest neighbor platoons for both velocity tracking and network formation

scenarios. In Section VII we present some simulation results and Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. Notations and Definitions

We denote an undirected graph (network) by $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ is a set of nodes (or vertices) and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the set of edges. Neighbors of node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ are given by the set $\mathcal{N}_i = \{v_j \in \mathcal{V} \mid (v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. The adjacency matrix of the graph is given by a symmetric and binary $n \times n$ matrix A, where element $A_{ij} = 1$ if $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$ and zero otherwise. The degree of node v_i is denoted by $d_i \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ij}$. For a given set of nodes $X \subset \mathcal{V}$, the *edge-boundary* (or just boundary) of the set is given by $\partial X \triangleq \{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E} \mid v_i \in X, v_j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus X\}$. The Laplacian matrix of the graph is given by $\mathcal{L} \triangleq D - A$, where $D = \mathrm{diag}(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$. The eigenvalues of the Laplacian are real and nonnegative, and are denoted by $0 = \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{L}) \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n(\mathcal{L})$. For a given subset $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{V}$ of nodes (which we term *grounded nodes*), the *grounded Laplacian* induced by $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_g$, and is obtained by removing the rows and columns of $\mathcal{L}$ corresponding to the nodes in $\mathcal{S}$. In this paper, *grounded nodes* represent *reference vehicles*. For the case where the underlying network is connected and there exists at least one grounded node, the grounded Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L}_g$ is a positive definite matrix [15]. For a given set $\mathcal{I}$, the number of members (cardinality) of the set is denoted by $|\mathcal{I}|$.

III. Problem Statement

Consider a connected network of n vehicles $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$. Each vehicle $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ is either a follower $v_i \in \mathcal{F}$ or a reference vehicle $v_i \in \mathcal{R}$. The position and longitudinal velocity of each vehicle v_i is denoted by scalars p_i and u_i, respectively, which evolve over time with particular dynamics. In this paper $\mathcal{P}(n, k)$ denotes a platoon of n vehicles where each vehicle can communicate with its k nearest neighbors from its back and k nearest neighbors from its front, for some $k \geq 1$. This is due to the limited communication range for each sensor in a vehicle and the distance between the consecutive vehicles. An example of $\mathcal{P}(n, k)$ is shown in Fig. 1.

Two control objectives are addressed in this paper: (i) control the velocity of the vehicles (velocity tracking) or (ii) regulate the distance between neighboring vehicles (network formation).



Fig. 1: A 2-nearest neighbor platoon of 5 vehicles, $\mathcal{P}(5,2)$. A reference vehicle is located in the middle.

Each vehicle v_i is governed by the second order dynamics $\ddot{p}_i(t) = q_i(t)$, or in vector notation

$$\ddot{\mathbf{p}}(t) = \mathbf{q}(t), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{p}(t) = [p_1(t), p_2(t), ..., p_n(t)]^T$ is the vector of positions and $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is the vector of control laws for either of the two above control objectives discussed in the following subsections.

A. *Velocity Tracking*

In this case, each follower vehicle tracks a reference velocity trajectory. The desired velocity is calculated by reference vehicles based on minimizing fuel consumption. This yields the following control laws for each follower and reference vehicle, [16]

$$q_i(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} k_u(u_j(t) - u_i(t)) & \forall v_i \in \mathcal{F}, \\ 0 & \forall v_i \in \mathcal{R}, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $k_u > 0$ is the control gain. The state (velocity) of the reference vehicles (which should be tracked by the followers) is assumed to be constant and is not affected by other vehicles.

Remark 1: One can define a control law $q_i(t) = \kappa(u^* - u_i(t))$ for all $v_i \in \mathcal{R}$ where u^* is the reference velocity. For sufficiently large κ it can be shown (by singular perturbation analysis) that the assumption $q_i(t) = 0$ in (2) is valid. □

Aggregating the velocities of all followers into a vector $\mathbf{u}_\mathcal{F}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{F}|}$, and the velocities of all reference vehicles into a vector $\mathbf{u}_\mathcal{R}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|}$,[1] one can write the following dynamics from

[1]Note that $\mathbf{u}_\mathcal{R}(t) = u^* \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{R}| \times 1}$ for all $t \geq 0$, where u^* is a unique reference velocity. The reason of using multiple reference vehicles with the same value is to increase the network robustness as will be discussed later.

(1) and (2):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{R}}(t) \end{bmatrix} = -k_u \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_g & \mathcal{L}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathcal{L}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) \\ \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{R}}(t) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_g \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{F}|\times|\mathcal{F}|}$ is the grounded Laplacian matrix, formed by removing the rows and columns corresponding to the reference vehicles. The control law for the follower vehicles in vector form becomes

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) = -k_u \mathcal{L}_g \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) - k_u \mathcal{L}_{12} \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{R}}(0). \tag{4}$$

Remark 2: The unique steady-state solution of (4) is $\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{F}}^{ss} = -\mathcal{L}_g^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{12}\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{R}}(0)$. We know that $\mathcal{L}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0}$ which yields $\mathcal{L}_g\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{F}|\times 1} + \mathcal{L}_{12}\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{R}|\times 1} = \mathbf{0}_{|\mathcal{F}|\times 1}$ and that results in $-\mathcal{L}_g^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{12}\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{R}|\times 1} = \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{F}|\times 1}$. Hence, $-\mathcal{L}_g^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{12}$ is a row stochastic matrix and since there is only one reference velocity, $\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}$ attains that value. □

Introducing $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) = \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}$, the error dynamics of (4) becomes

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) = -k_u \mathcal{L}_g \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t). \tag{5}$$

B. Network Formation

In this case, the objective for each follower vehicle is to maintain specific distances from its neighbor vehicles. The desired vehicle formation will be formed by a specific constant distance Δ_{ij} between vehicles v_i and v_j, which should satisfy $\Delta_{ij} = \Delta_{ik} + \Delta_{kj}$ for every triple $\{v_i, v_j, v_k\} \in \mathcal{V}$. The control law for each follower vehicle is [17]

$$q_i(t) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} k_p \left(p_j(t) - p_i(t) + \Delta_{ij}\right) + k_u \left(u_j(t) - u_i(t)\right), \tag{6}$$

where $k_p, k_u > 0$ are control gains. We define the tracking error $\tilde{p}_i(t) = p_i(t) - p_i^*(t)$, where $p_i^*(t)$ is the desired trajectory of vehicle v_i which should satisfy $\Delta_{ij} = p_i^*(t) - p_j^*(t)$ for all $v_i, v_j \in \mathcal{V}$. By rewriting (6) we have

$$\ddot{\tilde{p}}_i(t) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} k_p \left(\tilde{p}_j(t) - \tilde{p}_i(t)\right) + k_u \left(u_j(t) - u_i(t)\right), \tag{7}$$

which comes from the fact that the rigid formation requires $u_j^*(t) = u_i^*(t)$ which results in $\tilde{u}_j(t) - \tilde{u}_i(t) = u_j(t) - u_i(t)$. The error dynamics (7) in the state space form is

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) = \mathcal{B}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t), \tag{8}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{F}} = [\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, ..., \tilde{p}_{|\mathcal{F}|}, \dot{\tilde{p}}_1, \dot{\tilde{p}}_2, ..., \dot{\tilde{p}}_{|\mathcal{F}|}]$ and $\mathcal{B} = I_{|\mathcal{F}|\times|\mathcal{F}|} \otimes \mathcal{B}_1 + \mathcal{L}_g \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$, in which $\otimes$ is Kronecker product and

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -k_p & -k_u \end{bmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

Remark 3: Going forward we assume $k_p = k_u = 1$ and we focus on the effect of the network structure (not control gains) on the robustness of vehicle platoon. The results can be easily extended for all $k_p, k_u > 0$. □

The following theorem, introduces the spectrum of matrix $\mathcal{B}$ in (8) in terms of the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_g$.

Theorem 1 ([17]): The spectrum of $\mathcal{B}$, $\sigma(\mathcal{B})$, is

$$\sigma(\mathcal{B}) = \cup_{\lambda_i \in \sigma(\mathcal{L}_g)} \left\{ \sigma \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\lambda_i & -\lambda_i \end{bmatrix} \right\}. \tag{10}$$

Thus by forming the characteristic polynomial of (10) we have

$$\lambda_i(\mathcal{B}) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)}{2}\left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{4}{\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), & 1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{F}|, \\ -\frac{\lambda_{i-|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)}{2}\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{4}{\lambda_{i-|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), & i > |\mathcal{F}|, \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $i = 1, 2, ..., 2|\mathcal{F}|$. Based on the fact that $\lambda_{i-|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)$ for $|\mathcal{F}| \leq i \leq 2|\mathcal{F}|$ is the same as $\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)$ for $1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{F}|$, each eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_g$ in (11) forms two eigenvalues of $\mathcal{B}$ and since $\mathcal{L}_g$ is a positive definite matrix, the real parts of all of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{B}$ are negative. □

C. Robustness Notions for Vehicle Platoons

From now on we refer to the error dynamics (5) as *velocity tracking dynamics* and to (8) as *network formation dynamics*. These control policies are prone to imprecisions due to the inter-vehicle communication disturbances. Hence, both velocity tracking dynamics and network formation dynamics can be written in the following form

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathcal{J}\mathbf{w}(t), \tag{12}$$

where $\mathbf{w}(t)$ is a vector which represents bounded disturbances. Here $\mathcal{A} = -\mathcal{L}_g$, $\mathcal{J} = I_{|\mathcal{F}|\times|\mathcal{F}|}$ for the velocity tracking dynamics and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{J} = [I_{|\mathcal{F}|\times|\mathcal{F}|} \quad \mathbf{0}_{|\mathcal{F}|\times|\mathcal{F}|}]^T$ for the network formation dynamics. As output signals of interest, we consider *velocity* for the velocity tracking dynamics



Fig. 2: Input and outputs of (a) error dynamics (5) and (b) error dynamics (8).

and *position* for the network formation dynamics, as shown in Fig. 2. Based on the input-output representation of both dynamics, the robustness of vehicle platoon to disturbances is analyzed based on the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of the transfer function from the disturbances to the output signals.

Remark 4: The notion of system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm discussed in this paper is to address the robustness of each agent's state error (position or velocity) to external disturbances. Thus, it is different from the notion of $\mathcal{L}_2$ string stability [3], which addresses the effect of the disturbances on the first vehicle to the state error of the last vehicle in a platoon. □

In addition to disturbances, the inter-vehicle communication is prone to time delay which may inhibit tracking or even causes instability. More formally, updating policies (5) and (8) can be in the following form

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathcal{A}\mathbf{x}(t-\tau), \tag{13}$$

where $\tau \in [0, \tau_{\max}]$ is a constant time delay.

Remark 5: For velocity tracking dynamics (5) if each vehicle has instantaneous access to its own state, the dynamics have the form

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) = -D_g\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) + A_g\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t-\tau), \tag{14}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_g = D_g - A_g$. In this case since all of the principal minors of $\mathcal{L}_g$ are nonnegative and $\mathcal{L}_g$ is non-singular, (14) is asymptotically stable independent of the magnitude of the delays in the off-diagonal terms of $\mathcal{L}_g$ (Theorem 1 in [18]). Hence, for the sake of consistency, we introduce conditions for τ where (13) is stable for both dynamics (5) and (8). □

In the following section, a brief overview about the spectrum of the grounded Laplacian matrix is presented.

IV. Smallest and Largest Eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_g$

Spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_g$ has a pivotal role in the performance and robustness of the velocity tracking and network formation dynamics (5) and (8). The following theorems provide bounds on $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)$ and $\lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)$ based on network properties.

Theorem 2 ([15]): Consider a connected network $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$ with a set of reference vehicles $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{V}$. Let $\mathcal{L}_g$ be the grounded Laplacian matrix for $\mathcal{G}$. Let $\beta_i = |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{R}|$ be the number of reference vehicles in follower v_i's neighborhood. Then

$$\min_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\} \leq \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g) \leq \frac{|\partial\mathcal{R}|}{|\mathcal{F}|} \leq \max_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\} \leq |\mathcal{R}|. \tag{15}$$

□

Theorem 3 ([19]): Consider a connected graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$ with a set of reference vehicles $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{V}$. Let $\mathcal{L}_g$ be the grounded Laplacian matrix for $\mathcal{G}$. For the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_g$ we have

$$d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max} \leq \lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g) \leq 2d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}, \tag{16}$$

where $d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max} = \max_{v_i\in\mathcal{F}} d_i$, is the maximum degree over the follower vehicles. □

V. Robustness of Velocity Tracking Dynamics

In the previous section, some useful spectral properties of the grounded Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L}_g$ were introduced. In this section, we use those results to give graph theoretic conditions for the stability margin of dynamics (5) and its robustness to disturbances and time delay.

A. Stability Margin and Robustness to Disturbances

The stability margin of (5) is determined by $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)$. Hence, the graph theoretic bounds provided in (15) can be considered as bounds on the stability margin accordingly. Now suppose that there exists an additional disturbance vector $\mathbf{w}(t)$ in velocity tracking dynamics in the form of (12) which is

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) = -\mathcal{L}_g\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{F}}(t) + \mathbf{w}(t). \tag{17}$$

The transfer function of (17) is $G(s) = (sI + \mathcal{L}_g)^{-1}$. Here, the system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (17) is considered, defined as $||G||_\infty \triangleq \sup_{\omega\in\mathbb{R}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}_{max}(G^*(j\omega)G(j\omega))$ [20], as introduced in the following proposition.

Proposition 1 ([21]): The system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (17) is $||G||_\infty = \frac{1}{\lambda_1(L_g)}$.

Based on Proposition 1 and Theorem 2, the following bounds for $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (17) can be written:

$$\frac{1}{\max_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\}} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{|\partial\mathcal{R}|} \leq ||G||_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\min_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\}}. \tag{18}$$

For the case where $\min_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\} = 0$, the upper bound in (18) is infinity. According to (18), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1: Consider a vehicle platoon $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ with reference vehicle set $\mathcal{R}$ and follower set $\mathcal{F}$. Necessary and sufficient conditions for $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ to have $||G||_\infty < \gamma$ are to have $\max_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\} > \lfloor\frac{1}{\gamma}\rfloor$ and $\min_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\} > \lceil\frac{1}{\gamma}\rceil$, respectively.

The following theorem addresses necessary and sufficient conditions for the number of reference vehicles in $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ to have a non-expansive system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm (i.e. $||G||_\infty \leq 1$). Before that, a specific arrangement of the reference vehicles in the platoon is introduced.

Definition 1: An arrangement of reference vehicles is called *minimally dense* (MD) if $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ is partitioned into line segments with length $2k+1$ starting from one end such that in the *middle* of each partition one reference vehicle is located (which will be connected to all of the followers in that partition). □

Based on MD arrangement there exist $\lceil\frac{n}{2k+1}\rceil$ reference vehicles in $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$. The following theorem introduces conditions for $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ to have non-expansive $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm.

Theorem 4: Consider a k-nearest neighbor platoon $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ with dynamics (17). If there exist at least $|\mathcal{R}| = \lceil\frac{n}{2k+1}\rceil$ reference vehicles, then there exists an arrangement of the reference vehicles satisfying $||G||_\infty \leq 1$. Moreover if the number of reference vehicles is less than $\lceil\frac{n}{2k+1}\rceil$, then there is no arrangement of reference vehicles satisfying $||G||_\infty \leq 1$. □

Proof: First, the sufficient condition is explored. Based on Corollary 1, a sufficient condition for $||G||_\infty \leq 1$ is to have $\min_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\} \geq 1$. By doing an MD arrangement of $\lceil\frac{n}{2k+1}\rceil$ reference vehicles in $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ we will have $\min_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\} \geq 1$.

Next we have to show that with less than this number of reference vehicles, it is impossible to obtain $||G||_\infty \leq 1$. From a lower bound in (18), a necessary condition for $||G||_\infty \leq 1$ is to have $\frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{|\partial\mathcal{R}|} \leq 1$. Based on the fact that $|\partial\mathcal{R}| \leq 2k|\mathcal{R}|$ we have $\frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{2k|\mathcal{R}|} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{|\partial\mathcal{R}|}$. Thus $\frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{2k|\mathcal{R}|} \leq 1$ is a necessary condition for $||G||_\infty \leq 1$, which yields $|\mathcal{R}| \geq \frac{n}{2k+1}$. ■

Based on Theorem 4, the MD arrangement of reference vehicles in $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ provides the minimum possible number of reference vehicles to yield a non-expansive $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm.

B. Robustness to Time Delay

Here we discuss the stability of dynamics (5) when the vehicles update their states with a particular time delay $\tau \in [0, \tau_{max}]$. The dependency of the robustness of linear systems like (5) to time delay is discussed in the following theorem, which is based on a general result in [22].

Theorem 5: The velocity tracking dynamics (5) is asymptotically stable in the presence of constant time delay $\tau \in [0, \tau_{max}]$ if and only if

$$\tau_{\max} < \min_i \{\frac{\pi}{2\lambda_i(L_g)}\} = \frac{\pi}{2\lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)}. \tag{19}$$

□

Based on Theorems 3 and 5, the following proposition introduces necessary and sufficient conditions for the stability of $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ under time delay.

Proposition 2: A vehicle platoon $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ under velocity tracking dynamics (5) in the presence of constant time delay $\tau \in [0, \tau_{max}]$ is asymptotically stable if $\tau_{\max} \leq \frac{\pi}{8k}$ and it is unstable if $\tau_{\max} > \frac{\pi}{2k}$.

Proof: According to Theorems 3 and 5, necessary and sufficient conditions for asymptotic stability of (5) in the presence of time delay are $\tau_{\max} < \frac{\pi}{2d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}}$ and $\tau_{\max} < \frac{\pi}{4d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}}$, respectively, and according to the fact that $k \leq d^{\mathcal{F}}_{max} \leq 2k$ the results are obtained. ■

Remark 6: As can be concluded from Corollary 1 and Proposition 2, there is a trade-off between robustness to disturbances and time delay when the connectivity index k increases. In particular, by increasing k (for fixed number of reference vehicles) $\min_{i\in\mathcal{F}}\{\beta_i\}$ increases while the maximum delay $\tau_{\max}$ decreases. □

VI. Robustness of Network Formation Dynamics

Similarly to Section V, the performance and robustness of the network formation dynamics dynamics (8) are analyzed in this section.

A. Stability Margin and Robustness to Uncertainty

In a k-nearest neighbor platoon $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$, for the smallest magnitude of the real part of $\mathcal{B}$ (stability margin of (8)) the following proposition is presented.

Proposition 3: For the stability margin of the network formation dynamics (8) for the platoon $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ we have

$$|Re(\lambda_1(\mathcal{B}))| \geq \frac{\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)}{2}. \tag{20}$$

Proof: Based on Theorem 1 and (11), for the eigenvalue of $\mathcal{B}$ with the smallest magnitude of the real part two cases may occur: (i) If $1 - \frac{4}{\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)} \leq 0$ then $|Re(\lambda_1(\mathcal{B}))| = \frac{\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)}{2}$, (ii) If $1 - \frac{4}{\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)} > 0$ then $|Re(\lambda_1(\mathcal{B}))| > \frac{\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)}{2}$. ■

The following theorem gives an upper bound for the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of the network formation dynamics under the MD arrangement of reference vehicles.

Theorem 6: Consider $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ with a MD arrangement of reference vehicles. The $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm from disturbances to the position error of (8) satisfies $||G||_\infty \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$. □

Proof: Taking Laplace transform of (7) for zero initial conditions gives

$$G(s) = \left(s^2 I + (s+1)\mathcal{L}_g\right)^{-1} = M\left(s^2 I + (s+1)\Lambda\right)^{-1} M^T = M\,\mathrm{diag}(G_i(s))M^T, \tag{21}$$

where $M = [v_1, v_2, ..., v_{|\mathcal{F}|}]$ is a matrix formed by eigenvectors of $\mathcal{L}_g$ and $\mathrm{diag}(G_i(s))$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $G_i(s) = \frac{1}{s^2+\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)s+\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)}$ with the following maximum amplitudes

$$\mathcal{C}_i = \max_\omega |G_i(j\omega)| = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{4-\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)}}, & \text{if } \lambda_i \leq 2, \\ \frac{1}{\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

Hence, for system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm we have

$$||G||_\infty = \sup_\omega \max_i ||G_i(j\omega)|| = \max_i \mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{C}_1. \tag{23}$$

Now due to the fact that in MD arrangement we have $1 \leq \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g) \leq 2$, and considering the fact that in this interval $\mathcal{C}_1$ takes its maximum at $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g) = 1$ we have

$$||G||_\infty = \frac{2}{\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{4-\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}. \tag{24}$$

■

Theorems 4 and 6 show how the existence of multiple reference vehicles in a platoon can increase the robustness of the network against disturbances. In Table I, the system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of

the velocity tracking and network formation dynamics on $\mathcal{P}(n,k)$ for both single and multiple reference vehicles with MD arrangement, i.e. $|\mathcal{R}| = \lceil \frac{n}{2k+1} \rceil$, is summarized.[2]

TABLE I: System $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (5) and (8) for single and multiple reference vehicles with MD arrangement.

$\lvert\mathcal{R}\rvert$	Velocity Tracking (5)	Network Formation (8)
1	$\Theta(n^2)$	$\Theta(n^3)$
$\lceil \frac{n}{2k+1} \rceil$	≤ 1	$\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$

B. Robustness to Time Delay

The following proposition gives a sufficient condition for which the network formation dynamics (8) remains asymptotically stable in the presence of time delay.

Proposition 4: The network formation dynamics (8) is asymptotically stable in the presence of constant time delay $\tau \in [0, \tau_{\max}]$ if $\tau_{\max} < \frac{1}{4k}$.

Proof: Based on [24], a sufficient condition for (8) to remain stable in the presence of time delay is to have

$$\tau_{\max} < \frac{1}{\rho(\mathcal{B})}, \tag{25}$$

where $\rho(\mathcal{B})$ is the spectral radius of $\mathcal{B}$. Applying Theorem 1 and (11), the spectral radius of $\mathcal{B}$ yields:

$$\rho(\mathcal{B}) = \frac{\lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)}{2}\left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{4}{\lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \tag{26}$$

since in the MD arrangement in which $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g) \geq 1$ we have $\max_i |1 - \frac{4}{\lambda_i(\mathcal{L}_g)}| = |1 - \frac{4}{\lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)}|$. Therefore, based on the upper bound on $\lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}(\mathcal{L}_g)$ in (16), sufficient condition (25) can be rewritten as

$$\tau_{\max} < \frac{1}{d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max} + d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}\left(1 - \frac{2}{d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{27}$$

[2]In [13] it is shown that the system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm for network formation dynamics for $\mathcal{P}(n,1)$ (line graph) is $\Theta(n^3)$, which holds for any $k < \infty$ as well. Moreover, it can be easily shown that the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of the velocity tracking dynamics is $\Theta(n^2)$, due to the fact that for line graphs we have $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g) = \Theta(\frac{1}{n^2})$ [23].

and since $d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max} \geq 2$ we have $d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max} + d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}\left(1 - \frac{2}{d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}$. This yields the sufficient condition $\tau_{\max} < \frac{1}{2d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max}}$, and based on the fact that $d^{\mathcal{F}}_{\max} \leq 2k$ the result will be obtained. ■

Remark 7: Similar to what was mentioned in Remark 6 for velocity tracking dynamics, there is a trade-off between robustness to disturbances and time delay for the network formation dynamics. More specifically, by increasing network connectivity k the value of $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_g)$ increases and based on (22) the system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm decreases, while the spectral radius of $\mathcal{B}$ increases which results in decreasing the robustness to time delay. □

VII. Simulations

In this section, some simulation results are presented to confirm the theoretical contributions of the paper. The results are based on $\mathcal{P}(36, 4)$. Based on MD arrangement, there are four reference vehicles in $\mathcal{P}(36, 4)$.

Fig. 3 shows how necessary and sufficient conditions for the value of time delay mentioned in Proposition 2 apply for asymptotic stability of the velocity tracking dynamics (5) in the presence of time delay. The sufficient condition for the stability of the network formation dynamics (8) in the presence of time delay (presented in Proposition 4) is confirmed in Fig. 4. Fig. 5 shows how MD arrangement of the reference vehicles introduces tight necessary and sufficient conditions for system $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (5) to be non-expansive (Theorem 4). In particular, if one of the four reference vehicles in the MD arrangement of $\mathcal{P}(n, k)$ is removed, the resulting $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm is no longer less than one. On the other hand, as can be seen from Fig. 5 if an extra reference vehicle is added to $\mathcal{P}(n, k)$ (other than the existing reference vehicles from the MD arrangement), the resulting $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm will be strictly less than one. The results for the same scenario are shown for the network formation dynamics (8) as shown in Fig. 6 where removing a reference vehicle makes the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (8) larger than $\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \approx 1.15$. This confirms the tight sufficient condition mentioned in Theorem 6.

VIII. Summary and Conclusions

In this paper a set of graph theoretic conditions for the robustness of k-nearest neighbor vehicle platoons $\mathcal{P}(n, k)$ to disturbances and time delay have been derived and analyzed. In particular, a necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{P}(n, k)$ to have non-expansive $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm for velocity tracking dynamics has been provided (Theorem 4) by introducing a specific arrangement of



Fig. 3: (a) velocity tracking dynamics is stable for $\tau = 0.09 < \frac{\pi}{2k}$ and (b) unstable for $\tau = 0.4 > \frac{\pi}{8k}$.

reference vehicles. Moreover, the effect of such arrangement of reference vehicles on $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of network formation dynamics has been investigated (Theorem 6). Furthermore, the effect of the communication delay on the stability of velocity tracking dynamics and network formation dynamics has been addressed (Propositions 2 and 4). Our results show that there is a trade-off between robustness to time delay and robustness to disturbances. An avenue for future work in this direction is to generalize the results established in this paper to directed networks with non-homogeneous control gains.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, pp. 1520–1533, 2004.

[2] B. Bamieh, M. R. Jovanovic, P. Mitra, and S. Patterson, "Coherence in large-scale networks: Dimension-dependent limitations of local feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, pp. 2235–2249, 2012.

[3] P. Seiler, A. Pant, and K. Hedrick, "Disturbance propagation in vehicle strings," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 1835–1842, 2004.

[4] R. H. Middleton and J. H. Braslavsky, "String instability in classes of linear time invariant formation control with limited communication range," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 1519–1530, 2010.



Fig. 4: (a) network formation dynamics is stable for $\tau = 0.05 < \frac{1}{4k}$ and (b) unstable for $\tau = 0.1 > \frac{1}{4k}$.

[5] B. Bamieh, M. R. Jovanović, P. Mitra, and S. Patterson, "Coherence in large-scale networks: Dimension-dependent limitations of local feedback," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 2235–2249, 2012.

[6] F. Lin, M. Fardad, and M. R. Jovanović, "Optimal control of vehicular formations with nearest neighbor interactions," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 2203–2218, 2012.

[7] X. Liu, A. Goldsmith, S. Mahal, and K. J. Hedrick, "Effects of communication delay on string stability in vehicle platoons," *Proceedings of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pp. 625–630, 2001.

[8] L. Xiao, F. Gao, and J. Wang, "On scalability of platoon of automated vehicles for leader-predecessor information framework," *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*, pp. 1103–1108, 2009.

[9] V. D. H. Sebastian, K. H. Johansson, and D. V. Dimarogonas, "Fuel-optimal centralized coordination of truck platooning based on shortest paths," *American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 3740–3745, 2015.

[10] J. P. Koller, A. G. Colin, B. Besselink, and K. H. Johansson, "Fuel-efficient control of merging maneuvers for heavy-duty vehicle platooning," *18th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pp. 1702–1707, 2015.

[11] C. Chien and P. Ioannou, "Automatic vehicle-following," *American Control Conference*, pp. 1748–1752, 1992.

[12] S. Klinge and R. H. Middleton, "Time headway requirements for string stability of homogeneous linear unidirectionally connected systems," in *48th IEEE conference on Decision and control*, 2009, pp. 1992–1997.

[13] H. Hao and P. Barooah, "Stability and robustness of large platoons of vehicles with double-integrator models and nearest neighbor interaction," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 23, no. 18, pp. 2097–2122, 2013.

[14] I. Herman, D. Martinec, Z. Hurák, and M. Sebek, "Nonzero bound on fiedler eigenvalue causes exponential growth of



Fig. 5: (a) $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (5) with removing a single reference vehicle from the MD arrangement in $\mathcal{P}(36, 4)$ and (b) adding a single reference vehicle. The horizontal axis is the location of the added (removed) vehicle in the platoon.



Fig. 6: (a) $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of (8) with removing a single reference vehicle from the MD arrangement in $\mathcal{P}(36, 4)$ and (b) adding a single reference vehicle and its location .

h-infinity norm of vehicular platoon," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 2248–2253, 2015.

[15] M. Pirani and S. Sundaram, "On the smallest eigenvalue of grounded Laplacian matrices," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 509–514, 2016.

[16] A. Rahmani, M. Ji, M. Mesbahi, and M. Egerstedt, "Controllability of multi-agent systems from a graph-theoretic perspective," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 48, pp. 162–186, 2009.

[17] H. Hao, P. Barooah, and J. J. P. Veerman, "Effect of network structure on the stability margin of large vehicle formation with distributed control," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 4783–4788, 2010.

[18] J. Hofbauer and J. W. H. So, "Diagonal dominance and harmless off-diagonal delays," *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 128, pp. 2675–2682, 2000.

[19] M. Pirani, E. M. Shahrivar, B. Fidan, and S. Sundaram, "Robustness of leader - follower networked dynamical systems," *arXiv:1604.08651v1*, 2016.

[20] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover, "Robust and optimal control," *Prentice Hall*, 1996.

[21] M. Pirani, E. M. Shahrivar, and S. Sundaram, "Coherence and convergence rate in networked dynamical systems," *Proceedings of CDC 2015, the 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2015.

[22] M. Buslowicz, "Simple stability criterion for a class of delay differential systems," *International Journal of Systems Science*, vol. 18, pp. 993–995, 1987.

[23] S. C. W. Yueh, "Explicit eigenvalues and inverses of tridiagonal toeplitz matrices with four perturbed corners," *The Australian & New Zealand Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 49, pp. 361–388, 2008.

[24] S. I. Niculescu, "Delay effects on stability: A robust control approach," *Springer-Verlag*, 2001.